


Palestine Perspectives

Number 15

April 1985



ZRARIYYEH:
Another Trophy In
Israel's Bloody Record

IN THIS ISSUE

ARAFAT INTERVIEWED ON JORDANIAN-PLO AGREEMENT

Editorial Editorial Editorial

TERRORISM: BLOOD LIBEL AGAINST PALESTINIANS

Once upon a time, the Jewish people were victimized by a vicious accusation, known as the blood libel, which burdened them with the suspicion of kidnapping Christian children and murdering them to use their blood in religious ritual. It is one of the greatest ironies that they have become the inventors of a parallel libel against the Palestinian people: The libel of "terrorism."

The Palestinians are portrayed by Israel and its Zionist mouthpieces as cruel assassins bent on the destruction of Jewish life. In the process of pinning the "terrorist" label on the Palestinian people, the Zionists justified the dispossession and massacre of Palestinians, and encouraged neo-anti-Semitism against them.

The irony is compounded by the fact that the accusers of the Palestinians are themselves the most persistent practitioners of terrorism in the world today. Israel began its career with the Deir Yassin massacre of April 1948, bullied its way in the Middle East through a succession of massacres in Qibya (1953), Kufur Qassim (1956), Nahalin (1966), and crowned its gory fantasy with the destruction of Beirut, the massacres of Sabra and Shatila and the ongoing rampage in the villages of south Lebanon.

It has become fashionable, especially in the United States, to look for contorted explanations for what is a simple, natural, and universal reaction to a cruel injustice: rejection and resistance. Israel defines terrorism as any

Palestine Perspectives is published monthly from October to May and bimonthly from June-September by:

Palestine Research and Educational Center
818 18th Street, NW, Suite 645
Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 466-3205

Editor: Dr. Muhammad Hallaj
Assistant Editor: Khalil Jahshan
Production Manager: Foster K. Tucker

Signed articles express the views of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Palestine Research and Educational Center.

Subscription rates: In the U.S. and Canada, \$15/year (\$10 to students). Elsewhere, \$25/year. Single copies, \$1.50.

form of opposition to its will. Not only Palestinians, but now the Lebanese nationalists who struggle against what is clearly and universally acknowledged as military occupation of their country, are libeled as "terrorists."

Since when is resistance against occupation armies an act of terrorism? This definition of terrorism has never been accepted anywhere at any time. Yet the media in this country often parrots Israeli "doublespeak" when it labels its occupation forces as the victims of terrorism. It is even more appalling when the U.S. government bases its policy on such "doublespeak" when it refuses to deal with the PLO because it is nothing but "international thugs" as John Glenn described it during his presidential campaign.

We are not making this point to argue for a U.S.-PLO dialogue, although in principle, logic dictates that a country such as the U.S. which has elected itself as the general manager of the Arab-Israeli conflict should deal with all the parties to that conflict. As long as U.S. policy does not recognize the Palestinian people's nationhood and right to self-determination and independence, such a dialogue would not be useful, and in fact would be counterproductive. The last thing the Palestinians need is another party to pressure them to abandon their legitimate national rights.

What we are saying is that American public opinion and U.S. foreign policy should be based on reality and not on libelous stereotypes. If a small Palestinian state is dangerous to U.S. global interests, then it would be understandable for the U.S. to oppose it *on that ground*. The Reagan administration may be entitled to add another Grenada-type victory to its portfolio of achievements in foreign policy. But to base U.S. policy on Israel's warped vision, to condemn the Palestinians for a blood libel, is a form of madness unbecoming of the place or time in which we live.

The Palestinian and Lebanese people in occupied Lebanon and occupied Palestine have not only the right but also the responsibility to resist occupation and repression. The progress which has been made in human relations is largely due to opposition to injustice, not by its acceptance.

Oppressed peoples can and should talk to their oppressors about *how* to end oppression. But they cannot and must not talk to them about *whether or not* to end it. As long as Israel denies the Palestinian people's right to be free, the Palestinians cannot forego their right to armed struggle. This has been the universal experience of national liberation struggles from the American Revolution to this day. A blood libel against the Palestinian people does not override this fact.

It may be understandable that the Zionists propagate the blood libel of terrorism against the Palestinians, because they need it to justify what they have done to them. But America does not need it. It distorts its political vision and demeans its heritage. □

M. Hallaj

ISRAEL: RIPE FOR FASCISM

Dan Horowitz

[The writer is professor of political science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This article appeared originally in the Hebrew daily Davar, 7 December 1984.]

Israel is ripe for fascism. The political base is already there: the emerging alliance of tribal beliefs, religious zealotry and marketplace populism. There are candidates for the leadership: Arik Sharon, Rafael Eitan, Meir Kahane. And above all, the social conditions are propitious: a public that has experienced swinging inflation and now finds itself uncertain of employment and fearful for the security of its savings; a crisis of confidence in the ability of the democratic parliamentary regime to function; fierce enmity towards the adversary in a national conflict that is fraught with racist overtones.

High inflation engenders uncertainty and anxiety.... Anxiety generates a demand for nondemocratic leadership. The masses seek a charismatic figure to serve as a prop while the establishment calls for a "strongman" who will "impose order."

Racist attitudes are also being fostered by Gush Emunim and its doctrine. The direct confrontation between settlers and inhabitants in the territories has deteriorated from disturbances to counterterrorism. But equally important has been the injection of a religio-messianic content into the nationalist-political message: national identity is defined in tribal terms ("Jews vs. Goyim"); the dehumanization of the adversary is given an allegedly halachic basis ("the law of Amalek"); alarming associations between land ("land of our fathers") and blood (from "Jewish blood shall not go unavenged" to Rabbi Kahane's neo-Streicherian "purity of Jewish blood") begin to surface. Around the hard core of fanaticism a broader circle of adherents expressing varying degrees of sympathy is being formed: the murderers in the Jewish underground are abetted by condoners, understanders and forgivers; Arik Sharon does not dissociate himself from Meir Kahane even when the latter expresses the wish for future cooperation with Sharon/Eitan. Thus the trigger for Israeli fascism already exists.

Fascism will not materialize without a leader. A benighted zealot without roots in the Israeli experience such as Kahane will not succeed in the role; nor will a rough-hewn soldier-farmer-carpenter like Raffool [former chief of staff Rafael Eitan]. They are capable only of sowing the seeds of violent hatred for the Arabs, the political fruit of which will be reaped by others. A successful fascist leader requires the ability to engage in sophisticated manipulations in order to obtain power by democratic means and to maintain it by dictatorial means. His image must fulfill the expectations of those seeking a strong leader who will "impose order" and also of those who expect him to ignore legal constraints in dealing with the Arabs, "leftists," "defeatists" and "traitors." He must be capable of mobilizing mass support without weakening his ties with the elitist nationalists of Gush Emunim and Tchiya. This mantle would seem to be tailor-made for Arik Sharon. It is true that in the course of his career Sharon has been more a figure of anarchy than of order. But the paradoxical expectation that order will be imposed



precisely by a leader with a reputation for excess is characteristic of situations which have spawned fascist regimes.

Will Arik Sharon don the mantle that is ready for him and transform potentiality into actuality? For the moment, we may focus on one noteworthy feature of his behavior that gives rise to disquiet. Fascist leaders tend to equate their own good with the good of the people, to posit their private interests as national interests and to denounce their opponents as enemies of the people. Arik Sharon's behavior fits this pattern. His suit against *Time* is, for him, "the trial of the people of Israel."

There are still many people who cannot come to terms with the juxtaposition of the terms "Israeli" and "fascism." However, the notion of an Israeli terrorist underground also seemed fantastic only a year or so ago. When the underground was exposed, with the foiling of the attempted slaughter of dozens of innocent passengers—men, women and children—on public buses, and when it emerged that the underground's plans included also acts of lunacy such as the demolition of the Temple Mount [Aqsa] mosques, many people suddenly found these phenomena quite reasonable and perfectly understandable. The murderers and pogromists were the flesh and blood of Israeli society, and a good many people knew them personally. It was thus easier to attribute their acts to the alleged failures of the government, and to accept them, forgetting that it was in this manner that the perpetrators of the worst atrocities in history were perceived in their own countries.

There is no "deluxe fascism," no such thing as an undemocratic emergency regime for a limited period, no such thing as an enlightened dictatorship. Those now seeking no more than a strong leader to impose order and deal with the Arabs "with a firm hand" will soon discover that they are liable to become victims of the genie they helped release out of the bottle. By then it will be too late.



THE LOGIC OF A KAHANIST

David Oren

It is hard to write off 18-year-old Shlomi Cohen as a joke. He exists. The idea of trying to educate him differently today also seems impossible. The tall, black-haired youth is a partisan of Meir Kahane's worldview. No questions, no doubts, no reservations—everything is clear-cut and understood. "I'm a Libra," he says; "we believe in what we do—and we carry it through to the end..."

Q: *Kahane's solution is to expel the Arabs. That seems rather simplistic.*

A: It sounds simplistic and it is simple. Look, today's youth are looking for clear answers. Not one of the existing parties has a clear answer. There's something nebulous about all of them, something unclear. The Alignment's idea—to return territories—I reject utterly and completely. The Likud doesn't express an unequivocal opinion on the subject. I know there are people in the Likud who think exactly as Kahane does but are afraid to say so. The same with Tzichya: they talk about annexing Judea and Samaria but they don't give an unequivocal

answer to the question of what you do with the Arabs in the territories, with one-and-a-half million people. Raffool [former chief of staff Rafael Eitan] does think the Arabs should be kicked out, but he doesn't say so. He's a nothing. Afraid to speak out.

I know that Kahane's solution sounds very simplistic, but that's its attraction, especially for the young. He gives an unequivocal answer. He doesn't shirk laying things on the line. Without fear or shame. Exactly like the people on the other side of the political fence, who aren't ashamed to say that they support a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria. And that's what the young people like. They believe in it.

Q: *Is that really the solution, then—to expel a million-and-a-half Arabs? Does that seem sensible?*

A: That's everyone's mistake. I didn't use the word "expel." Look, let's say that in the next elections Kahane gets ten seats. He'll be a force to be reckoned with. After those elections more than a million Arabs will leave of their own accord. Especially if Kahane—with the parliamentary strength he obtains in the elections—becomes a key minister. Minister of Defense, for example. After that we'll pass laws that will make things difficult for the Arabs and they'll have no choice but to leave. Legally speaking we'll make them second-class citizens. They'll have freedom when it comes to religion, and in their private lives, but they won't have the same status as Jews. Naturally they won't be able to vote for the Knesset or be elected. If that doesn't do it, we'll pass laws so that they'll leave. That's all.

Q: *Do you really believe that the world will simply sit back and let this happen?*

A: I don't care whether they accept it or not. That needn't concern us at all. For some reasons the present Israeli leaders think about what the world will say before making a single move. We have to get rid of that attitude. I don't think we'll have a problem on that score with the Americans. The Americans know that of all the countries of the region, Israel is the most stable. It can be trusted. It's a democratic country.

Q: *Do you call a country that will pass the kind of laws you're proposing a democratic state? It will be a racist society. To pass the kind of laws you're suggesting a dictatorship will have to be established here. Some people will certainly prefer to leave the country if such legislation goes through the Knesset.*

A: So some will leave—that doesn't bother me. If you're referring to leftists such as Yossi Sarid and Shulamit Aloni I won't be upset. On the contrary. May their names be wiped out. I don't think I'm a racist. I think that in terms of values, we Jews are the chosen people, that's all. I have nothing specific against the Arabs. They're just a threat to me, and therefore I have to defend myself. *I'd adopt the same line of thought if there were Chinese here as a minority, or Norwegians.*

I still favor democracy. *But democracy for Jews alone.* I know people would like to hear me use the word "dictatorship," but I won't give them that pleasure. I expressly mean democracy—but in my version for the Jews only. What's wrong with that? What could be more reasonable?

[Excerpts chosen from *Ha'aretz* weekly magazine, 21 December 1984.]

In Brief

FILM FORBIDDEN

The Israeli censor banned a Swedish documentary on the life of a Palestinian refugee family. The 80-minute film, produced by Swedish documentarian Pea Holmquist by grants from Swedish institutes, is called *Gaza Ghetto* and depicts the life of a Palestinian refugee family from 1948 to 1984. The film is available with English subtitles from *New Time Films* of New York (212) 206-8607.

FROM SOUTH AFRICA TO ISRAEL

A Dallas, Texas, company which invests mutual funds in South Africa is branching out to Israel. The company, Strategic Management, Inc., which advertises Israel as a country "on the threshold of assuming the role of a superpower," is marketing a mutual fund made up entirely of Israeli stocks.

WORTH READING

They Dare To Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby, is ex-congressman Paul Findley's book about the Zionist lobby and its influence in U.S. politics, about to be released by its publisher, Lawrence Hill & Co. of Westpoint, Connecticut.

GENTILES FIRST, THEN JEWS

Ettie Ronel

[Interview with Dr. Aviezer Ravitsky of Netivot Shalom, a religious peace group. *Al Hamishmar*, 2 January 1985.]

On the same day the Knesset voted down the Mapam-sponsored Law against Racism, with the backing of Alignment MKs who claimed that the existing law was adequate, MK Meir Kahane used his Knesset office to award a prize for the best composition on the theme: "How Mattityahu and the Maccabees would have solved the problem of Yossi Sarid and Saridism." The competition had been organized by Kahane's Kach movement. The winner, Yonah Pressburger, a pupil of the Yemin Orde boarding school near Haifa, wrote: "The people of Israel are in a difficult position today. The Hellenized Jew of those days at least knew the Torah and his deeds were motivated by knowledge and intent. Today's Hellenists don't even know what tefillin or synagogues are. You cannot kill a man before you explain to him what it means to be a Jew and what Torat Yisrael is. This is a different situation from that of Mattityahu, who for the first time killed a Jew and removed the stain of corruption from the people of Israel, or that of Pinhas Ben-Eliezer Ben-Aharon Hachohen, who cleansed the people of Israel by killing the Jew and the Midianite woman. If we were to consider what the Maccabees would do today—I think their first step would be to attack the media, which are the stronghold of Yossi Sarid and Saridism. Then they would isolate Yossi Sarid and the other Hellenizing ringleaders because 'he who misleads the many cannot be allowed to repent.' We cannot allow the leaders of the Hellenists to influence the people of Israel."

Kahane himself wrote in similar vein in his regular column in the "Jewish Press": "True, the Torah speaks of 'loving thy neighbor as thyself.' But—it also demands that 'you shall cast the evil out from your midst,' even if this means killing a Jew who merits it in a humane fashion, that is, by selecting a 'decent execution.' *Judaism does not advocate tolerance and universal love.* Judaism is based on the idea that there is good and evil in the world. And who are we that we should forgive when the Jewish people are in danger? Who are we to turn a blind eye when evil threatens our very existence? If Yossi Sarid and Shulamit Aloni and Mapam and Meir Wilner and the rest of those deranged Hellenists are threatening the very existence of Judaism, the Jewish people and Israel—there is nothing moral in any display of tolerance towards them."

Q: What is your comment on this?

A: Anybody who thinks that Kahane will be satisfied by the expulsion of the Arabs from Israel is mistaken. Once he has finished with the Arabs he will start on secular Jews, including those in his own movement, the people he is exploiting today. Pronouncements against Jews desecrating the Sabbath or eating "unclean" have been much harsher than any against Moslems. So I have no doubt that his indirect call for the murder of Arabs will become a call for the murder of Jews. It has already been said by our sages that "he who robs the Gentile will ultimately rob the Jew, and he who murders the Gentile will ultimately murder the Jew." □



ARAFAT INTERVIEWED ON JORDANIAN-PLO AGREEMENT

[The following are excerpts from an interview with PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasser Arafat by the editor of *Al-Yom Assabeh*, 11 March 1985]:

Question: *The Palestinian-Jordanian Agreement has stirred up a storm which has not yet subsided. What were the reasons that made you conclude this agreement?*

Answer: First, we must say that there are resolutions which were adopted by two PNC sessions—the 16th session held in Algiers and the 17th session held in Amman stipulating the need for establishing distinct Jordanian-Palestinian relations and a confederation between Palestine and Jordan. Last year following the 16th session, a Palestinian-Jordanian attempt was made to reach an agreement in fulfillment of the resolutions adopted at Algiers. That attempt was unsuccessful, because of a deadlock between us and our Jordanian brothers....

During the PNC session King Hussein resubmitted his ideas which he had submitted to us during the dialogue meetings. The PNC delineated certain constant factors regarding King Hussein's initiative and then referred the issue to the new Executive Committee to follow it up....

We submitted our ideas and the Jordanians submitted theirs. Then the Jordanian side sent us a plan of action representing the Jordanian viewpoint. The Palestinian leadership met in a joint session of the PLO Executive Committee and the Central Committee of Fateh. It studied the issues and sent to Jordan a Palestinian plan representing the Palestinian viewpoint....

As a result an invitation from His Majesty the king was extended to me personally to visit Amman where talks were held for more than 5½ hours, after which...this agreement was reached.

Question: *It has been said that the aim of the agreement was to open the door for dialogue with the U.S. in accordance with the Reagan initiative. What is your reply to this attack?*

Answer: I would like to remind those who express this idea that the American position remains the same even after the agreement—no to a Palestinian state; no to the PLO; no to an international conference. Some pedants forgot that the Israeli military campaign against southern Lebanon and the city of Beirut was aimed at the PLO. This was not an Israeli campaign, but an American campaign.

Question: *Is there a coincidence in timing or link between the realization of the Palestinian-Jordanian Agreement and the consultations that King Fahd held in Washington with U.S. President Ronald Reagan?*

(continued on page 5)



ARAFAT (continued from page 4)

Answer: I cannot say this. But as is known, the Jordanian-Palestinian agreement was communicated to His Majesty King Fahd. The king was informed prior to the Washington meeting of the Jordanian and Palestinian viewpoints. He was then informed of the text of the agreement.

Question: Was it agreed that the accord should remain secret, and were you surprised when Jordan released it?

Answer: In order to be fair, we did not say that the agreement was secret. But we agreed not to announce it now, but to postpone its announcement. We were surprised by its announcement by the new Jordanian Information Minister. I personally see no harm in its announcement. But what troubled us was the fact that it was announced without any reference to the fact that there were some clarifications which the Palestinian side requested to be introduced to the text of the agreement.

Question: It has been said that the agreement has an explanatory memorandum. Is there one? Does this answer the ambiguous points... in the agreement?

Answer: As I have told you, we sent an explanatory memorandum... to His Majesty King Hussein—containing some Palestinian views about these ambiguous points.

Question: Can the contents of this explanatory memorandum be disclosed?

Answer: Two points—one concerning the joint Arab delegation, and another explanatory point in which the phrase, “upon the completion of Israeli withdrawal” was added. As for the sentence which speaks about the spirit of the Fez summit, I proposed that it should be amended to read: “In affirmation of the resolutions of the Fez summit. ...”

Question: President Husni Mubarak has interpreted the agreement through calling for joint Palestinian-Jordanian delegation to negotiate with Israel under the auspices of the U.S.?

Answer: No, this is not an Egyptian interpretation of the agreement, rather these are ideas of which we were informed after their announcement. These are Egyptian ideas which President Mubarak believed might help give an impetus to movement regarding the Middle East problem. We had our viewpoint concerning these ideas, and the Jordanian brothers had their point of view. We announced our position clearly, and we brought it to the attention of President Husni Mubarak... We said that we adhere to the Palestinian-Jordanian Agreement, and we adhere to the resolutions adopted by the PNC sessions. We stated this while appreciating the efforts made by Egypt and its fraternal desire to serve the Palestinian cause from its own vantage point...

Question: Well, in light of these diverse positions, interpretations and initiatives, can you give us a clear and simplified Palestinian understanding of the agreement?

Answer: The agreement is aimed... at ending the Israeli occupation and the occupation of all Arab territories. I repeat, all Arab territories... this means the Golan, southern Lebanon, Palestinian territories, and Egyptian Tabahs. There is more than one Egyptian Tabah and above all Jerusalem. Everyone knows that Jerusalem is the most serious point in the Arab-Israeli conflict and in the Arab-American conflict...

In addition, we said in the agreement that movement must derive from an international conference under UN auspices to be attended by the five permanent member states of the Security Council and *all the parties concerned in the Middle East conflict. I repeat all the parties including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing with the other parties.* In our opinion as Palestinians, all this should take place within a joint Arab delegation. The Jordanian viewpoint says: within the context of a Palestinian-Jordanian delegation, but if the Arabs want to participate, then there would be no objection to an Arab delegation. I would like to emphasize again that the Palestinian-Jordanian Agreement is a draft plan for action between us and King Hussein. It is not a draft plan of action between us and the U.S. or between us and Israel. It is not a Camp David agreement or a Camp Murphy agreement. By basing the agreement on the Fez Summit resolution, it became evident that it emanates from an Arab framework...

Question: During all this period you remained silent... Has not the time arrived for you to clarify the situation?

Answer: First, I want to talk about Palestinian views that were made public and consequently caused some confusion. This is a matter to which we have grown accustomed in the Palestinian arena: The 1969 Cairo Agreement with Lebanon was debated for years, so were the Melkart Accord, the Fez Summit and its resolutions, the Fahd plan, my agreement with King Hussein in 1970, the resolution of the Rabat Summit in 1974... Democracy is a source of pride for us. Anyone has the right to express his opinion, but all submit in the end to the resolution that is adopted.

Question: As a leader were you not annoyed by these positions?

Answer: I follow the saying of Omar: May God bless the person who corrects a deviation by Omar. I have not come to office with 99.99% or even 99.97%; nor have I arrived on the back of a tank. I came by means of free elections, and I told my brothers many times to spare me this arduous task. I am a struggler and I consider this democracy one of the sources of my strength. It is not a point of weakness. . . . As for the agreement: it has been signed and it has become a Palestinian-Jordanian document. Furthermore, I agree with announcing the agreement together with the amendments approved by the Palestinian leadership and dispatched to His Majesty King Hussein, especially since His Majesty readily agreed to discuss these amendments and to accept the principle of its amendment.

Question: *However there are those who say that some of the requested amendments are so fundamental and numerous that you are faced with an agreement of a new type and subsequently the start of a new dialogue.*

Answer: This is not correct. It is known that when the Palestinian leadership (the Executive Committee and the Central Committee of Fateh) met they said that there are three points for amendment and clarification. These points have been sent in a memorandum. As for new dialogue, I say that the dialogue will continue, and will proceed toward agreement on many points, because this agreement with Jordan is the launching pad for action. . . .

Question: *Abu 'Ammar: Would you please outline for the . . . reader the red lines of the Palestinian initiative?*

Answer: We have certain constant factors. First, to end the Israeli occupation of all Arab territories including Jerusalem. This is a red line. Jerusalem specifically is a red line. Second, to resolve the Palestinian refugee problem in all its aspects and in accordance with UN resolutions. Third, to resolve the Palestinian question in all its aspects, because the Palestinian question is not just a question of refugees. Fourth, the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and we do not agree to discuss or toy with this point. Fifth, to establish a Palestinian state, noting that our PNC decreed at two consecutive sessions, the 16th and 17th, that this state is to be united in confederation with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. This obligates both the Palestinian people and the Palestinian leadership. Sixth, we proceed within an Arab framework, that is, the decisions of the Fez summit conference. Seventh, we cling to the idea of the international conference, because we cannot resort to the method of Anwar Sadat which we reject.

We, our Arab brothers and our friends, are hardly capable of obtaining something acceptable from Israel and the U.S. What if we gave up our friends and the Arabs? What would we obtain? We would obtain only crumbs, and whoever wants to be satisfied with crumbs, let him look for a leader other than myself and let him look for a leadership other than the leadership of the PLO.

Question: *Do you positively or negatively assess the outcome of the Palestinian-Jordanian Agreement?*

Answer: I assess it positively. On the popular level, there is unanimity inside and outside the occupied territory about the agreement. There are some fears among certain Palestinian sources. I believe it is the right of the Palestinians to have fears because we suffered much and we have come out from one massacre to another and from one war to another and from one destitution to another and from

one journey to another and from one exodus to another; hence it is the right of the Palestinians to have fears. This fear is legitimate. However at the same time, there is satisfaction with this agreement, because it translates and embodies what was adopted by the Palestine National Council, and because the agreement places the PLO once again at the closest point to Jerusalem, 30 km away from Jerusalem. From Al-Salt mountains I can see the lights of Jerusalem. All this after the Israeli enemy thought that after our departure from Beirut and Tripoli and my expulsion from Damascus, the PLO has departed from the confrontation countries and are far way from it.

Question: *On the level of international diplomatic activity, do you believe that the agreement has achieved success for the PLO?*

Answer: Naturally, the agreement has achieved success. It has drawn good reaction from many of our friends and has cornered our enemies. It is not by chance that Menachem Begin came out from his isolation to oppose the agreement. He did not interfere in the Israeli elections, nor did he interfere in the subject of the Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon. . . . Begin came out from his silence only to attack the agreement. . . .

Question: *The Soviet Union announced that the agreement caused Palestinian divisions. Do you believe that indicates Soviet opposition to the agreement?*

Answer: No. I believe that the Soviet Union, since we differed with Syria, has stood with its Syrian friend more than with its Palestinian friend. I am not linked to it with a treaty of friendship. Naturally as a pragmatic man I can understand the importance of Syrian territory to Soviet international strategy. The Palestinian revolution has no territory to offer.

Question: *The current Israeli repression campaign against the villages of southern Lebanon and against Al-Rashidiyah and Al-Bus (refugee camps)—is it merely a military repressive operation or does it also have political aims?*

Answer: It definitely has political aims. They want to remain within the border zone, and hence they want to impose full control. It is not by mere chance that the Israeli bulldozer operating in Deheisheh camp on the West Bank is the same bulldozer now operating in the Lebanese village of Ma'rakah. This Israeli invasion will be known in history as the bulldozer invasion. They want to render the Lebanese areas devoid of inhabitants and to effect demographic changes in them.

Question: *In light of the Israeli withdrawal, all Israeli strategic aims for the war declared against the PLO in 1982 have failed. It failed to destroy the PLO; it failed to physically eliminate the Palestinian people; and it failed to impose a pro-Israel regime. Is this Israeli failure, however, matched by a Palestinian gain?*

Answer: Naturally, and I say this with pride. As shown by events, we have not lost our position in Lebanon. We have lost the presence of the leadership in Lebanon, but we still have 450,000 citizens in Lebanon and no one can erase their existence. What is more important is that our Lebanese allies have restored their base of cohesion, and this is another source of Lebanese and Palestinian gain in confronting the invasion. The Israelis have won a battle, however they lost the war. □



INDEPENDENT PLO DELEGATION A MUST

Interview with Hasan Abdel Rahman

[The following interview was conducted by Palestine Perspectives with the Director of the Palestine Information Office in Washington, D.C., Mr. Hasan Abdel Rahman]:

Q: Is it true that there have been amendments to the PLO-Jordanian Agreement of 11 February?

A: First of all it should be stressed that the PLO and the government of Jordan reached "a framework for an agreement" rather than an agreement. This framework requires extensive discussions to interpret and clarify its provisions.

The PLO understands that the United Nations approved over the years a number of resolutions on the Middle East. These include Security Council Resolution 242 which addresses the aftermath of the 1967 war stipulating Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories it occupied during that war. Then there are a number of other U.N. resolutions, including the Partition Resolution of 1947 and Resolution 3236 which defines Palestinian national rights and the terms of settling the Palestine question. All of these resolutions must serve as the basis of a settlement in order to achieve comprehensive peace. This is what the PLO understands by the PLO-Jordanian framework which refers to U.N. General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The PLO cannot accept the singling out of any one resolution to serve as a basis for settlement, especially 242, simply because it does not address the Palestine question and does not lead to a comprehensive settlement.

The other issue in the PLO-Jordanian framework which required clarification was the one dealing with the Palestinian-Jordanian confederation. It is understood that a confederation is a relationship between equally independent states. Since Jordan is independent, then Palestine also must become independent before a confederal relationship can be established. This is what the PLO understood by the provision that the proposed confederation would come about when it becomes possible for the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples to do so. To avoid any misunderstanding, the PLO proposed a clarification which states that the proposed confederation is to be established between the independent states of Jordan and Palestine as soon as Israel withdraws from the occupied Palestinian territories.

Q: Have these clarifications on U.N. resolutions and the issue of confederation been accepted by Jordan?

A: An addendum to the agreement containing these clarifications has been accepted by the government of Jordan.

Q: There was also ambiguity regarding Palestinian representation: Would it be a PLO delegation? Would it be a part of a Jordanian delegation or an Arab delegation?

A: This issue has also been clarified to mean that since the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestin-

ian people, there would be an independent Palestinian delegation chosen by the PLO from its own ranks, which would participate on an equal footing within the context of a unified Arab delegation. This clarification was also accepted as an integral part of the agreement.

The PLO, of course, understands that any negotiations would be within the framework of an international conference attended by the five permanent members of the Security Council as well as the parties directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Q: Why do you think it is important for the PLO to insist on an independent delegation?

A: Simply because Palestinian rights without a party to represent, advocate and defend them would become abstract.

Q: There have been press reports that certain individuals, not known to be PLO officials, may be included in a Palestinian delegation.

A: Such reports are totally without foundation. As far as the PLO is concerned, speculation about the composition of the Palestinian delegation is premature. Until the U.S. and Israel concede Palestinian national rights and the right of the PLO to speak on behalf of these rights, negotiations are not possible and the composition of a delegation is premature.

Q: What do you think Murphy is doing in the Middle East. The cold reception in Washington of Arab heads of state and the PLO-Jordanian Agreement indicate U.S. reluctance to move. Then Murphy is sent to the Middle East to indicate movement. What do you make out of it?

A: Nothing really. The U.S. wants to exclude the PLO and does not recognize Palestinian national rights. On the other hand, it wants to induce the Arab states into falling in line with its position—which is really the Israeli position. This, in my view, is Murphy's mission.

Similar U.S. attempts to exclude the PLO, to ignore Palestinian national rights, and to secure Arab acceptance of that policy have failed in the past, and there is no reason why they should not fail again. □

JORDANIAN-PLO ACCORD AMENDED

Official Palestinian sources in Tunis confirmed that Jordan has agreed in principle to Palestinian clarifications concerning two crucial points in the Jordanian-Palestinian Agreement of February 11, 1985: the composition of the negotiating team in peace talks and the timing of Palestinian self-determination. The proposed amendments were submitted to Jordan in the form of a memorandum of understanding to be appended to the text of the agreement.

The first amendment modified item (2) in the agreement by specifying that "*Palestinians will exercise their inalienable right of self-determination when Jordanians and Palestinians will be able to achieve Israeli withdrawal within the context of the formation of the proposed confederated Arab States of Jordan and Palestine,*" rather than, "*when Jordanians and Palestinians will be able to do so within the context...*" as stipulated in the text of the agreement.

The second amendment calls for PLO participation in the peace process "*within a unified Arab delegation,*" instead of the original call in item (5) for "*a joint delegation*"—meaning a Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. [See *Palestine Perspectives*, March 1985]. □

ANALYSIS... ISRAEL'S WAR ON BOOKS

Once again, the Israeli occupation army in the West Bank stormed and closed a university. Three Birzeit University officials, including the acting president, were awakened by a midnight knock on their doors and taken to witness the ravishing of their campus by a large Israeli force.

Israel's special war on Palestinian universities has reached an all time low in its conduct. In this most recent skirmish, the Israelis distinguished themselves for brutality against the freedom of thought. Although their soldiers smashed doors and windows, destroyed furniture and equipment, and arrested a large number of students, books were the principal victim of their paranoia. It was a book exhibit at the university which provoked their wrath, and confiscated books were the principal booty of their assault.

Israel's attack on Palestinian education, manifested in repeated disruption of academic life in the occupied territories as well as harassment of Palestinian students who are Israeli citizens studying in Israeli universities, reveals a grim aspect of Israel's behavior. The emphasis on Israel's political and military disruptiveness in the Middle East conceals what may be a more dangerous symptom of the Israeli problem.


Israel's aggressiveness is both a cause and a consequence of its contempt for the rights and needs of others. It shows that Israel's rejection of Palestinian rights does not stop with the right of self-determination. Anyone who thinks, as Israel does, that the possession of books, any books, justifies the use of force is dangerous to himself as well as to others. Supporters of Israel, no matter who they are or where they may be, need to think about the nature of a state which believes that books threaten its security.

Israel has become notorious for its militarism. Not everyone yet understands that it also represents a mentality which is repugnant to the ideals and concepts of the twentieth century. Those who find excuses and justifications for the periodic outbursts of this mentality, or cover them up, share Israel's guilt. Those who accept or acquiesce in such periodic flare-ups of Israeli madness under the pretext of defending Israel's "right to exist" offend our intelligence. The right to exist entitles no one to become a menace to others.

BIRZEIT: A UNIVERSITY UNDER SIEGE

Since 1983, Birzeit University has been closed at least ten times by military order. These closures ranged from one week to three months at a time. The total period during which the university was closed exceeds 16 months. The following is a chronological list of these closures:

December 15-December 31, 1973	2 weeks
March 26-April 1, 1979	1 week
May 3-July 2, 1979	2 months
November 14-November 22, 1980	1 week
November 4, 1981-January 4, 1982	2 months
February 16-April 16, 1982	2 months
July 8-October 8, 1982	3 months
February 15-February 28, 1983	2 weeks
February 2-May 2, 1984	3 months (old campus)
April 2-May 2, 1984	1 month (new campus)
March 2-May 2, 1985	2 months (new campus)



BIRZEIT UNIVERSITY CLOSED

The Israeli occupation authorities closed down the new Birzeit University campus on the West Bank for two months. The decision on March 8, signed by General Ori Orr, came one week after conducting a midnight raid on both campuses at Birzeit under the pretext of confiscating "inciting material" in the form of books, posters and tapes due to be displayed or distributed at an annual exhibit commemorating the foundation of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP). Over 50 people associated with the university were detained for investigation.



Immediately after the raid, the Israeli military authorities declared the Birzeit campuses closed military areas establishing checkpoints around the village to prevent students and faculty from reaching campus. The Israeli order bars Birzeit students and faculty from entering three out of the four colleges on campus, thus directly affecting 60 percent of the 2400 student body.

Officials at Birzeit issued a statement to the press on March 4 denying the allegations made by the Israelis and questioning their motives. It accused the Israeli government of staging a "media blitz, orchestrated by the military authorities... to slander and discredit the university in the eyes of the general public."

(continued on page 9)



Israeli soldiers block the main road to Birzeit University.

BIRZEIT

(continued from page 8)

Birzeit officials denied responsibility for materials allegedly seized on campus by Israeli soldiers since the book exhibit area was raided without the accompaniment of any university official. The statement explained that the Israeli invasion of campus and its methods of searching its facilities were "illegal and ensured that no accurate account of materials seized could be produced."

The press release emphasized that "no materials related to the preparation of Molotov cocktails or other explosive devices were present at this exhibit" as claimed by Captain Eli Shazar, spokesman for the Civil Administration, the Israeli military branch that controls the territories occupied since 1967.

The Board of Trustees of Birzeit University issued its own press release on March 2 calling the Israeli raid, "a new link in a series of recurrent infringements on academic freedom which aim at obstructing university education and the development of Palestinian Arab society." This marks the tenth closure of Birzeit University by the Israeli government. In academic year 1981-82, Birzeit was closed for a total of 7 months.

The Israeli Committee of Solidarity with Birzeit appealed to local and international public opinion

to protest the arbitrary closure of the university and to stand up for academic freedom for all. The appeal was issued at a press conference held March 12 at the American Colony Hotel in East Jerusalem in the presence of Birzeit acting President Gabi Baramki, university spokesman Albert Aghazarian, Birzeit lawyer Raja Shehadeh, and Israeli professor Stan Cohen of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Baramki also telegraphed Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin calling for the "immediate rescinding of the order," which he described as a "blatant violation of human and academic rights." □

ARAB STUDENTS PROTEST CRACKDOWN

Arab students at Haifa University and the Hebrew University held several demonstrations and sit-ins in mid-March to protest the Israeli crackdown on campuses resulting in the arrest of several student leaders and their suspension from the university. On March 14, about 2000 Palestinian and Jewish students and supporters demonstrated outside Haifa University calling for the release of detained students and their readmittance to classes. They also called for an investigation of university officials who invited police on campus to disperse earlier demonstrations. A similar protest

by 500 students was held in Jerusalem at the Hebrew University campus.

The demonstrations were provoked by a March 10 incident in Haifa in which Israeli police used tear gas and clubs to disperse a crowd of 100 Arab students protesting the dismissal of two colleagues for alleged "illegal activities" during a lecture last month by former chief of staff Rafael Eitan, who represents the extremist and racist Techiya party in the Knesset. Eitan's lecture instigated a fist fight resulting in the arrest and suspension of several Arab students.

Professor Yohanan Hoffman of Haifa University, who witnessed the brutal police intervention stated that the incident "reminded me of my childhood in Nazi Germany." He said that "it was painful to see years of cooperation between Arabs and Jews at the university crumble in a few hours." □

ISRAELIS RAID GAZA LIBRARY

Israeli soldiers raided the Red Crescent Society (Red Cross) in Gaza on February 20 and confiscated from its library more than 40 books, a number of periodicals and several wall paintings.

Red Crescent officials told *Al-Fajr* (15 March 1985) that an Israeli military force from the Gaza military government, led by Major Hassoun, surrounded the building and occupied its offices. Hassoun and three other Israeli officers ransacked the library sorting its books one-by-one for more than an hour. They also confiscated back issues of local magazines published in Jerusalem, as well as a number of paintings decorating the walls of the library.

The Red Crescent library is the only public library in Gaza whose population exceeds 450,000. Israeli soldiers raided the facility in a similar manner two years ago confiscating a number of books deemed illegal by the occupation authorities. At that time, the Israelis brought the librarian and the administrator of the Red Crescent Society before an Israeli military court where they were heavily fined. □

REPRESSION AND APARTHEID UNDER ISRAELI OCCUPATION

Massarueh: *How long have you been concerned with the rights of political prisoners, and why did your report concentrate on Far'a prison?*

Kuttab: I have been dealing with this issue since 1979, when I completed my studies in international law and returned home. The Law in the Service of Man is interested in the rule of law and human rights. We make every effort to be objective and scientific. Our researchers gather only information which can be verified and documented.

The reasons why our recent report focused on Far'a prison is that its inmates suffer particularly harsh treatment. Unlike other prisons, it comes directly under the authority of the Israeli army rather than the prisons authority. It is not a place where detainees spend a prison sentence, but where they are tortured and humiliated for the purpose of intimidating and terrorizing the Palestinians, especially the youth, in the hope of deterring resistance to the occupation.

Massarueh: *What was the State Department's reaction to your report?*

Kuttab: The State Department and the U.S. consulate in Jerusalem are hesitant to criticize Israel, a state they consider to be friendly. It is also worried about congressional reaction, a problem it feels that it does not need. They also said that Yitzhak Rabin, the Israeli minister of defense, claimed that our organization was hostile to Israel. The fact is that Law in the Service of Man is legally registered, and if we were hostile they would arrest us and put us in prison. We only defend human rights guaranteed by international law. Israel's violations of these rights speak against it. It is not we, but Israel's own behavior which condemns it.

Massarueh: *Is the U.S. consulate in Jerusalem prepared to listen to your voice?*

Kuttab: We do not prepare our reports for the U.S. consulate, but for anyone interested in human rights. The U.S. consulate in Jerusalem, like all other American diplomatic missions, is required to

[Early in February 1985, **Jonathan Kuttab**, co-director of Law in the Service of Man, the Palestinian (West Bank) affiliate of the Geneva-based International Commission of Jurists, brought to the attention of the Human Rights Division at the U.S. State Department Israeli violations of the human rights of Palestinian political prisoners in the occupied territories. The report focuses on the ordeal of political prisoners at the notorious Far'a detention center.]

On February 13, Elliot Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, said that the report was forwarded to the U.S. consulate in Jerusalem for verification and comment. No further action has been taken.

During Mr. Kuttab's visit to Washington, he was interviewed by Abdulsalam Massarueh. Following are excerpts from that interview—Editor]:

report on the human rights situation in its area, according to American legislation from the Carter administration, which links U.S. foreign aid to various countries to their behavior in the field of human rights.

Massarueh: *What is the reaction of Israeli public opinion to your findings regarding their country's violation of human rights in the occupied territories?*

Kuttab: Israel tries to conceal the reality of life under occupation from its own people. You would be surprised by the degree of ignorance in Israel, even in liberal circles, about what happens in the occupied territories. That is why the reports we prepare and the facts we uncover are very important. And that is why Israeli officials, like Rabin, try to discredit our work by labeling us as a "hostile" organization.

Israeli public opinion is an important influence on the Israeli establishment, but it is kept in the dark about the occupied territories.

Massarueh: *Do you intend to study and report on other issues such as settlements?*

Kuttab: Law in the Service of Man is a legal organization interested in the rule of law and human rights. We have not been dealing with political or economic questions. We have been, however, interested in the legal dimensions of these issues. For example, we have reported on Israel's exploitation of the law to dispossess Palestinian landowners, and we made a study of the use of terrorism by Jewish settlers in the occupied territories. We also studied the military orders under which the Israeli occupation

authorities govern the West Bank and Gaza, including Military Order 854 which affects higher education.

In a way we are concerned with all that happens in the occupied territories, but our concern is with the legal aspects and ramifications of life under occupation. It is clear that what Israel is doing in the occupied Palestinian territories is creating a system of *de jure* apartheid, by applying different laws to Jewish settlers and to Palestinians. Israel is trying hard to conceal this fact from its own people as well as from world public opinion. It is trying to avoid being stigmatized like South Africa, although it is creating a similar system. □

ARAB PEACE MOVEMENT

Knesset Member Abd Al-Wahhab Darawsheh (Alignment) announced the establishment of an Arab peace movement to mobilize Palestinian peace groups living under Israeli control since 1948. The movement would be similar to "Peace Now" currently operating in the Jewish sector of Israeli society.

Darawsheh explained that "Israel's Arabs" are citizens of the state, but they also form part of the Palestinian people. As such, they can serve as a bridge to peace between Israel and the Palestinians. The founding council proposed by Darawsheh includes 42 members: 13 from the Alignment, 14 from HADASH (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality led by RAKAH), 8 from the Progressive List for Peace, 3 from Yahad (Weizman), 2 from Shinuy, 1 from the Citizens Rights Movement, and 1

(continued on page 11)



AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Report on Town Arrest

The human rights organization Amnesty International has issued a report on Israel's use of town arrest to restrict freedom for political reasons. The report documents 148 cases of town arrest orders, giving the names of restricted persons, their ages, personal data at the time of restriction, their town, and the length of period involved. The report concludes that "the curtailment of these people's freedom of movement is in many cases a punishment for their nonviolent political activity." Following are excerpts from the introduction to the report:

"Since February 1979, Amnesty International has been working on behalf of people in Israel and the Occupied Territories whose physical movement has been restricted by administrative order. These people, though not imprisoned, are ordered to stay within the confines of their town or village for a specified period, usually for an initial period of six months, although this is frequently renewed. During this period, they are neither formally charged nor brought before a court of law. Most are also required to report daily to their local police station, and most are not permitted to leave their homes between sunset and sunrise. The police may check their whereabouts at any time, which includes entering their homes at night.

Up until 1979, town arrest orders had rarely been used. Since the beginning of 1980, according to Amnesty International's information, at least 148 people have been issued with town arrest orders.... An average of 66 people are under town arrest every year.

Those affected by town arrest orders have been Palestinians and Druze from Israel and the Occupied Territories. Most are political activ-

ists opposed to the Israeli occupation, who are outspoken in their criticism of Israeli policies and in their support for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). They have included mayors (who were dismissed from office in 1981/2), journalists, doctors, lawyers, trade unionists, teachers, writers, and students (many of them members of university student councils)....

Written permission from the military commander is needed before a person can leave the designated area. This can be difficult to get and has frequently been refused. As a result, people under town arrest have faced difficulties in carrying out their work or study effectively, if their place of restriction is other than their place of work or study; in some cases people have simply been unable to carry on their work or study at all; they may be unable to continue their nonviolent political activities, or at least be unable to attend political or professional meetings or conferences elsewhere in Israel, or the Occupied Territories, or abroad; they may face difficulties or long delays in getting adequate medical treatment if this is not available in their home town; and they may find their family and social life severely disrupted.

Although town arrest orders may only be issued when they are deemed by the military authorities to be essential for reasons of security, Amnesty International believes that the curtailment of these people's freedom of movement is in many cases a punishment for their nonviolent political activity. Amnesty International is also concerned that they are physically restricted without being formally charged or brought before a court of law." □

ARAB PEACE MOVEMENT

(continued from page 10)

from the National Religious Party.

Progressive Palestinians dedicated to the cause of peace have voiced their opposition to Darawshah's plan. Officials in HADASH expressed their commitment to peace only through joint Arab-Jewish cooperation and not through segregated organizations based on chauvinism or racism. □

FUNDRAISING FOR ISRAELI TERRORISM

Two members of the Israeli Knesset just completed a fundraising tour in the U.S. on behalf of Jewish terrorists currently in Israeli jails for violent crimes committed against Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories. Deputy Knesset Speaker Meir Cohen-Avidov (Likud) and Yuval Ne'eman (Tehiya) raised \$70,000 in five days of meetings with American Jews in New York and Miami. Most of these contributions were raised in Jewish synagogues and at private meetings under the auspices of *Keren Hebron*, a radical Zionist front registered in the U.S. as a tax-deductible charity.

Cohen-Avidov told *The Jerusalem Post* (16 March 1985) that the donations would go to help defray the legal costs of Jewish terror suspects and to support their dependents. The Israeli parliamentarian, known for his extremist and racist political views, said that "should the suspects be convicted and sentenced, I know that *I can go back to those same American Jews and ask them to mount a mass campaign to ask for a presidential pardon here, or at least leniency.*"

Meanwhile, two Israeli cabinet members appeared as character witnesses for Uri Me'ir, a member of the Jewish terrorist underground, at his Jerusalem trial March 10. Minister of Agriculture Arye Nehamkin (Labor) and Minister Yossef Shapira (Morasha) praised the terror suspect for his active role in establishing Jewish settlements. Me'ir is charged with conspiracy to murder Palestinian politician Dr. Ahmad Hamzeh Natshe of Hebron. The plan was never carried out. Mr. Nehamkin told the court that "Uri was very active in founding the Ramat Magshumim settlement in the Golan Heights. *I was impressed by his ability, his honesty, and his courage.*" According to *Ha'aretz* (11 March 1985), charges against Me'ir were reduced through plea bargaining to belonging to a terrorist organization, transporting arms, and attempting to carry out a terrorist attack. □

COMMENTARY... ISRAEL'S EMPEROR'S CLOTHES

Again, the United States used its veto to shelter Israel from Security Council reprimand for the brutality of its occupation army in the south of Lebanon. And again, it rationalized this latest deviation from the opinion of mankind with the pretext that the proposed resolution was "not balanced." This pretext, which has been frequently used to shelter Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples, is understood by Israel to be a license to act as the regional bully of the Middle East.

It is difficult to understand the sort of balance that would save U.N. resolutions from U.S. opposition. One can assume that the U.S. expects the victim to share the blame for the violence. After all, in any and every situation, there would be less conflict if the oppressed would gracefully submit to oppression, something which the Lebanese have failed to do. But, considering America's heritage and ideals, it is equally difficult to believe that the U.S. really expects the world community to condemn the victims for their resistance to oppression.


The inescapable conclusion is that the alleged imbalance of U.N. resolutions is nothing but an adaptation of the well-known fable about the emperor's clothes, which only the U.S. can see.

The truth of the matter is that the U.S. has given Israel and its American lobby a veto over U.S. policy in the Middle East. During the most recent presidential election campaign, Vice-President George Bush promised the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) that the U.S., among other things, would vote in the U.N. against any resolution which condemns Israel for anything [see *Palestine Perspectives*, May 1984, p. 13]. It was part of Israel's scheme to make the United States the underwriter of Israel's policies and ambitions.

In order to get the American people to shoulder this onerous material and moral burden, Israel's guardians in this country fabricated a battery of alleged U.S. "obligations" and "commitments" to Israel. The most recently-discovered "commitment" is to see to it that Israel is put above the law no matter how outrageously it transgresses against others.

There was a time, during the Johnson administration, when American blood and treasure were wasted in the jungles of Vietnam under the cover of an alleged "commitment" to its warlords. Then the American people demanded to know what these commitments were, by whom they were made, and for what purpose. Subsequent congressional hearings on the matter revealed that such "commitments" were nothing but a thinly disguised cover for an unpopular policy. Some policymakers simply took advantage of America's sense of honor to persist in a policy which lacked popular support, using the pretext of a mythical "commitment."

The same charade is being played on Israel's behalf. The U.S. does have interests in the Middle East, and like every other country is entitled to pursue its national interest within the permissive confines of international law. But it is one thing for the U.S. to promote its legitimate national interests, and something entirely different to allow itself to be used as an instrument by a client state such as Israel. □




MURPHY DISPATCHED TO MIDEAST

In response to recent Arab attempts to persuade the Reagan administration to reactivate its quest for peace in the Middle East, Secretary of State George P. Shultz dispatched his assistant secretary for Near Eastern Affairs to the region to explore recent proposals for renewed Arab-Israeli peace talks and to assess the prospects for active U.S. involvement in reviving the peace process.

Arab leaders who visited Washington recently urged President Reagan to end his passive policy toward the Middle East by seizing the opportunity presented by the Jordanian-Palestinian accord of February 11, toward revitalizing the moribund peace process. King Fahd of Saudi Arabia and President Husni Mubarak of Egypt urged Mr. Reagan to establish a dialogue with the Jordanians and Palestinians in order to renew the search for peace in the area. President Mubarak submitted to the U.S. administration a three-stage plan calling for dialogue between the U.S. and a Jordanian-Palestinian delegation and leading eventually to direct negotiations with Israel over the future of the West Bank and Gaza occupied by Israel since June 1967.

American officials have been extremely cautious in their response to Arab overtures. While acknowledging that some movement has been made by Arab parties in the region, administration officials have insisted that peace can only be achieved through direct negotiations with Israel and that accelerated U.S. participation in the peace process is untimely. A senior U.S. official in Washington admitted that the Murphy mission is part of U.S. maneuvering to postpone a decision while seeking more information from concerned Arab parties to clarify what Washington perceives as ambiguities in the Mu-

(continued on page 13)



LEBANESE PROTEST

A series of protests against Israeli occupation and repression in Lebanon took place in Washington and other cities around the United States in late March. The protests included pickets in front of the White House extending for two weeks, and a Day of Solidarity with the People of South Lebanon, on March 26, organized by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Lebanon.

During the March 26 Day of Solidarity, demonstrations were held in front of the Capitol in Washington, in the United Nations Plaza in New York, and Israeli consulates in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston.

The protests focused on Israeli acts of terrorism in Lebanon including the demolition of homes, the murder of civilians, the destruction of orchards, and mass arrests and curfews. The protesters called for immediate and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, an end to Israel's repressive measures, and urged support for the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon as well as the



Washington demonstration against Israeli practices in Lebanon.

right of the Lebanese people to resist the Israeli occupation.

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Lebanon includes numerous American and Arab-American organizations and individuals. It issued the following statement on the occasion of the Day of Solidarity with the People of South Lebanon:

Israel's occupation of south Lebanon has continued for more than 1,000 days. In response to the growing resistance to its occupation policies, the Israeli military recently introduced its "Iron Fist" campaign. The policy has led to entire villages being placed under siege, scores of civilians, including children, being killed or wounded, hundreds of people being arbitrarily detained without charges, the demolition of homes, the bulldozing of orchards, and violations of the sanctity of schools, hospitals, and religious institutions.

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Lebanon calls for a nationwide day of solidarity with the people of south Lebanon, a day for Americans to demonstrate their support for the rights to freedom of the people of Lebanon. Please join us in demanding an end to Israel's repressive policies and an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the south of Lebanon as called for in the UN resolutions.

Israel's actions in south Lebanon are flagrant violations of the basic human rights of the Lebanese and Palestinians who live there. They are in specific violation of the Geneva Convention of 1949 to which Israel itself is a signatory. People who care about the protection of human rights must demonstrate opposition to these Israeli violations.

The people of south Lebanon want the occupation to end. They want to be reunified with the rest of their country. Their goals need your support. The territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon are compromised as long as Israel continues to occupy any part of the south. You can lend your support for the people of south Lebanon and the territorial integrity of their country by participating in the demonstrations in your city. □

Picket in front of the White House



Photo: Khalil Jahshan

MURPHY

(continued from page 12)

barak proposal. Experts in Washington point out that the Reagan administration is not anxious to adopt an activist role in the Middle East in the hope that a weakened Arab position would lead to further concessions which might facilitate Israeli participation and U.S. mediation. Furthermore, U.S. hesitation is also blamed on current Israeli preoccupation with two major crises—withdrawal from Lebanon and chronic economic problems—which deprives Israel of the desire and the will to engage the Arabs in a meaningful search for peace.

Thus, it remains to be seen whether the Murphy mission is simply a time-buying measure by the U.S. to avoid a crucial decision that requires renewed American involvement or an honest attempt to feel out the different parties to the conflict as a prelude to defining a constructive role for the U.S. in the region.

In a recent interview with representatives of the Arab press in the United States, Mr. Hasan Abdel Rahman, Director of the Palestine Information Office in Washington, D.C., stated that the U.S. administration is simply playing for time to give the peace process an illusion of movement. He charged the administration with dillydallying in its response to Arab initiatives hoping to extract additional concessions from the PLO. Rahman appealed for a unified Arab position in order to deal effectively with the United States. □

"QUOTE UNQUOTE"

With the onset of the economic crisis and the growth of unemployment, one could hear the familiar refrain: Get rid of the Arabs!... Unemployment threatens us all. It is a breeding ground for the kind of ideas that brought Hitler to power in Germany. People tend to believe that it can't happen here. Yet not so long ago, no one believed that Kahanism could ever make such inroads into the minds of the public.

Muhammad Watad
Knesset Member (Mapam)
Hadashot
8 January 1985

Israel doesn't need the territories, and certainly doesn't need the phantom villages established there at a dizzying rate. It is inconceivable that at a time when thousands of unemployed are desperately waiting for new industries to be installed in the development towns, the government should be investing in the territories: this is giving way to extortion by pressure groups. Before making pronouncements on a Greater Israel, it would be well to think for a moment of what is happening in little Israel.

Baruch Elmekeis
Hadashot
14 January 1985

The forced conversion of the Jews of Ethiopia is a reprehensible and degrading act, one which undermines their confidence in their traditions and heritage.... The Ethiopian Jews are not Europeans and they cannot assert themselves. They are black, ill, hungry and ignorant of the laws of the land, its customs and their rights as human beings. For these reasons, the government of Israel has shamelessly abandoned them to the religious establishment which is now forcing them to undergo ritualistic procedures—in the name of the State and against their will.

Shulamit Aloni
Knesset Member (CRM)
Yedi'ot Aharonot
7 January 1985

We look upon the Jews as the apple of God's eye.

Jerry Falwell
The Jerusalem Post
16 March 1985

The national consciousness of the Palestinian people has now matured to the point where nationhood is its logical expression. Whatever the boundaries of a future Palestine, whatever its relationship to Jordan, the 1,250,000 Palestinian Arabs of the West Bank and Gaza cannot forever live in stateless limbo.

C. Robert Zelnick
ABC News Correspondent
Christian Science Monitor
15 March 1985



U.S. VETOES RESOLUTION ON LEBANON

The United States vetoed on March 12 a United Nations Security Council resolution condemning "Israeli practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon... which are in violation of the rules and principles of international law." The Lebanese-sponsored resolution won the approval of 11 of the council's 15 members. Countries voting in support of the resolution were: France, the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, China, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Thailand, Peru, Trinidad/Tobago and Burkina Faso (Upper Volta). Britain, Australia and Denmark abstained. The U.S. veto was the only vote against the resolution, leaving Washington totally isolated in the international community.

In addition to condemning Israel's "Iron Fist" policy against the civilian population of southern Lebanon, the resolution called on Israel to immediately halt its crack-down there and "unconditionally" withdraw its forces from Lebanon.

Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick complained that the debate in the Security Council was unfair to Israel because it "applies double standards" rather than the realities of Lebanon. She insisted on equating Israeli occupation of Lebanon with Lebanese national resistance by stating that the resolution "does not accord Israel fair treatment... We don't believe an unbalanced resolution will end the agony of Lebanon." Kirkpatrick claimed that the U.S. would have been prepared to support a resolution that urged restraint on "all parties" in Lebanon.

Throughout the heated debate preceding the March 12 vote, the U.S. maneuvered in vain behind the scenes in an attempt to prevent the anti-Israeli resolution from coming to a vote. This was manifested in the intensive pressure applied on Western allies to oppose the resolution. Preventing the Lebanese from securing the nine votes necessary to ensure passage would have made a U.S. veto unnecessary. However, the refusal of France to succumb to U.S. pressure forced the Reagan administration to play its veto trump card. The administration was hesitating to use this option due to internal Israeli considerations and for fear that a veto would embarrass President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt who was in Washington for talks with President Reagan. "It couldn't have come at a worse time," one U.S. official sighed. Some American officials have expressed concern that the U.S. veto might provoke anti-American actions in Lebanon in the form of attacks against American citizens and installations as happened last September.

After the vote Lebanese Ambassador Rashid Fakhoury told the Security Council that the U.S. veto "left the people of southern Lebanon the victim of Israeli crimes, encouraging Israel to proceed with its brutal policies in defiance of the international community. □

THE FALASHAS: FROM THE FIRE TO THE FRYING PAN

The Falashas are facing "the morning after" in Israel, and they are unhappy with what they see. One of the elders of the Ethiopian Jews whose "rescue" by Israel was heralded with much fanfare put it this way: "Through all the generations of our persecution, our worst enemies never imagined a way to hurt us the way we have been hurt by our brethren."

This disillusionment with Israeli society was voiced by the Ethiopian Jew during a meeting with Israel's chief rabbis Avraham Shapiro and Mordechai Eliahu. He was expressing the shock of Ethiopian Jews, recently transported to Israel, at a rabbinical ruling that they must undergo a conversion to become authentic Jews.

The Ethiopians revealed that they have been threatened with retaliation if they did not comply

with the conversion ruling. They said that "people from all over the country" threatened to withhold needed economic assistance from the Ethiopians.

The *Jerusalem Post* (Int'l. ed., February 16) reported that the rabbis "had no answer" to the Ethiopians' complaint that men with grandchildren were shamelessly told that they must undergo a marriage ceremony to legitimize their families. "We suffered for thousands of years for the Torah," one Ethiopian leader said. "We never dreamed that we would come here only to be told we weren't really Jews."

The Ethiopians threatened that if the rabbinate insists on the demand for conversion, they would ask for recognition as a distinct and separate community.

Some of the Falashas have found

it difficult to place their children in schools. A *Habad* (religious) school in Upper Nazareth refused to admit Falasha students on the grounds that "it is not yet clear if the Ethiopians are Jewish." □

WITH SUCH FRIENDS...

One of the nicest things about bigotry is that it tends to be self-destructive. This fact is being clearly manifested in Israel. Zionist bigotry has so distorted reality that even Israeli universities are becoming centers of fantasy rather than learning. And when a society begins to live on fantasy, it begins to consume its future.

A professor Paul Eidelberg, of Israel's Bar Ilan University, treated the readers of the *Washington Jewish Week* (28 February 1985) to a sample of the caliber of intellect which now enlightens Israel's youth. He proposed a new solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. This is the way the man sees it, in his own words:

"If the [Israeli] left consisted of tough-minded instead of soft or liberalized Marxists, it would not be disposed to surrender Judea or Samaria [West Bank] until the world of Islam had acquired the technological foundations necessary for the humanization of the Islamic consciousness, at which time Muslims would cease to be Muslims, thereby dissolving the entire issue." □



**Palestine
Research
and
Educational
Center**

818 18th Street, NW
Suite 645
Washington, DC 20006